

January 31, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

Latin America, where most of the people of this world live, is to find a way to carry knowledge to the individual farm operator. We have the knowledge and the techniques. The missing ingredient is how to get that knowledge and techniques accepted and put into practice by the millions of people who are still trying to scratch out an existence with methods that aren't much different from the days of Moses.

I know of no one more qualified to discuss this subject than the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who in 1961 was appointed by the late President Kennedy to take charge of the newly created White House Office on Food for Peace.

Speaking before the National Limestone Institute, Senator McGovern stressed not only the importance of food in supplying nutrition to hungry people all over the world, but also stressed the importance of food as a part of a world peace program.

I ask unanimous consent that his address before the National Limestone Institute be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR GEORGE MCGOVERN BEFORE THE NATIONAL LIMESTONE INSTITUTE

Chairman Nettels, President Bob Koch, my distinguished colleagues in the Congress, ladies and gentlemen. It is true as the Chairman has just said that my theme tonight is a broad bipartisan one in character, and I am especially grateful to be introduced so kindly by the State Chairman of the Kansas Republican Party. I am just hopeful that I can work out some way to persuade the Republican Chairman in my own State to be equally kind when he introduces me in South Dakota.

I have come to feel almost a part of the National Limestone Institute, and I am very proud of the relationship that I have had with this organization in the few years I have been privileged to serve in Washington. I am grateful for the opportunity that you have given me to stand in this place tonight, this honor has been given over the years to some of the men in public life that I most admire; men from both of our great political parties who have been an inspiration to me.

I have especially appreciated working with you in recent years to arouse our fellow-citizens to the absolute necessity of facing up to the Food and Population Crisis that confronts the world today. I am grateful for the tireless and the highly capable man who represents you here in Washington, your President Bob Koch. I have come to the conclusion that there is only one thing that Bob is really incapable of doing, that is turning down a job that he feels is important and worth doing. As a consequence of that quality, he is both greatly appreciated and I am afraid he is greatly overworked. As all of you in the NLI know, he agreed to accept the responsibility of the position as Executive Director of the Committee on the World Food Crisis a little over a year ago and it has been a very arduous addition to his efforts, which he has discharged wonderfully well, as he always does in any undertaking. I might say, Bob, that I needed your organizational genius on my side in the U.S. Senate this afternoon when I made an effort as a comparatively new member of that body to try to do something about limiting debate. I learned that the filibuster is still a more powerful institution than the forces a Junior Senator from South Dakota can rally in opposition to it, at least at the moment.

My admiration for the National Limestone Institute runs beyond your President, as distinguished as he is. You have given our country outstanding service down through

the years both individually and collectively. Not the least of these services has been to defend and to promote successfully a Soil Conservation Program which, now when we most need it, assures this country the capacity to meet our own food demands and also to lead the world in a tremendously important effort—the battle against hunger.

That battle in my judgment is the most important one, with the most urgent priority, that confronts the people of the United States. It is more important than a race to the moon, as important as may be. The moon may very well be made of green cheese, but we can't bring it back to earth to eat by any means yet found and it is the empty stomachs here on this earth that ought to be our primary concern.

I was traveling with a small group of other Congressmen in Egypt some ten years ago when the Soviet Union launched its first sputnik into outer space. That was a very important scientific achievement. We were in a rather primitive part of that country, and it was two or three days before we learned of what had happened. In spite of the sensational way in which that event was announced, and in spite of its significance, we quickly learned that there were far more people in Egypt concerned about who could put food on their table than who had launched the first sputnik into outer space. This is true in all of the less developed, uncommitted nations. So, we are talking tonight about the most urgent priority of our time—the battle against hunger.

We are concerned about World Communism, which is a challenge to all of the things that we hold worthwhile in this country. We have demonstrated our willingness, if a single Viet Cong sticks his head up in the jungle, to expend hundreds of thousands, if not, millions of dollars and risk the lives of some of our best men, to try to dispose of him and the threat he represents. Yet the best single defense that we have been able to find in the last twenty years against the appeal of Communism is a full stomach and a hopeful heart, but we respond to that opportunity timidly and hesitantly although the costs are relatively small and no loss of American lives is involved.

Senator George Aiken once made the statement to a group of visiting farm people here in Washington that in the years since World War II American food has prevented more countries from sliding down the hill into Communism, than all of the sophisticated military hardware that we have shipped to our friends around the world, and that is true. Our food has done more to spread and strengthen freedom and democracy than military might.

One of the basic strengths of the American system is the partnership in many areas of our national life between important public purposes and private enterprise. For example, the seed corn industry and its salesmen had a major role in the almost universal adoption a few years ago of new hybrid varieties of corn which set off a great surge in our productivity. In the same manner your industry has transmitted to hundreds of thousands of farms across this country the materials and the soil building practices essential to the basic soil resource of our country and to the well being of the American people.

One of the most difficult and frustrating problems that we face in speeding the adoption of modern agricultural practices in the developing countries of Asia, and Africa and Latin America, where most of the people of this world live, is to find a way to carry knowledge to the individual farm operator. We have the knowledge, and the techniques. The missing ingredient is how to get that knowledge and techniques accepted and put into practice by the millions of people who are still trying to scratch out an existence with methods that aren't much different from the days of Moses.

It is not too difficult to train a few dozen or even a hundred technicians for a developing country. But it is very hard to reach all the people and to secure the acceptance and the practice of new knowledge and of new techniques by large numbers of individual producers, particularly when most of them are illiterate. Congress Bob Dole of Kansas and others, including myself, have suggested a farmer-to-farmer corp as one practical device that we might use to reach out onto the farms of the emerging countries. That authority is incorporated in the new Food for Peace or Food for Freedom legislation passed by the Congress just before we adjourned last year. *But we are also going to have to stimulate the appearance of your private counterparts, fertilizer and other agricultural supply businesses with their promotion and sales techniques—actually educational techniques—to get necessary results as measured by the crucial statistics of production in the race between food supplies on one hand and hungry stomachs on the other.*

One American feed company that I happen to know about was able to put several hundred salesmen promoting poultry and egg production into the field in Colombia the third year after it had opened a plant in that country. That was done at no cost to the American taxpayer as a part of their private business operation. I don't know how any government could duplicate that task so quickly even at great public expense. But we know that our task is great, and that success depends on reaching and getting the acceptance by millions of producers of new agricultural methods.

The Indian food crisis of the last few months has dramatized the food crisis. Congressman W. R. Poage, the Chairman of the House Agricultural Committee, and some of his colleagues have just come back from taking a close look at that potentially tragic situation which is in the minds of all of us tonight. But what we are really confronted with is an even larger problem of world-wide chronic hunger. Half of all the human beings on this planet are suffering from undernourishment in one form or another. Either they don't have enough to eat or they have the wrong kinds of things to eat, lacking in protein, vitamins and minerals essential to health. Furthermore, the increase of food production in the world is now moving only half as fast as the increase in the number of stomachs to feed. Unless we can find some way to do a better job of balancing food supplies and food productivity in the world with population growth then cataclysmic famines as deadly as a nuclear war can face us within 20 or 25 years and that means within the lives of most of the people in this room. There will be no peace in that kind of a world.

Nikita Krushchev warned the Red Chinese some years ago that if there were a nuclear war the survivors would envy the dead. Famines of the kind that are projected when we look at the food and population curves, can be just as devastating as the nuclear prospect. The United States cannot escape the responsibility, either morally or from the standpoint of naked self-interest, of leading a worldwide war against hunger. Ultimately we must mesh our domestic farm policy into a world food policy that takes recognition of the stark facts of hunger and want. Even the most callous individuals cannot contemplate lightly the prospect of living on an island of plenty in a world wracked by massive famine. There will be no security—no peace—in that kind of a world.

We have been moving toward a constructive world food policy for more than 20 years. We have made some very significant strides in that direction, but we have been moving far too slowly if a crisis is to be averted.

The first World Food Congress was held 23 years ago, in 1944, at Hot Springs, Vir-

ginia. Out of that came the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations. Its first Director General, Lord John Boyd Orr, who has since been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, worked unsuccessfully but courageously, and I think brilliantly, for a World Food Board. It would have been a great multi-lateral world agency that pooled the excess production of the developed countries, beyond their normal trade requirements, in an international effort to achieve Freedom From Want. Some 10 years later in 1954, as Mr. Nettels reminded us, during the administration of President Eisenhower, the Congress authorized the use of our unwanted surplus commodities to help food deficit countries. That was a landmark step, although it was limited largely to the use of surpluses that had accumulated in spite of very strenuous efforts to prevent their accumulation. In 1961, the late President Kennedy created the first full-time White House Office on Food For Peace and gave me the privilege of heading up an effort to expand and more effectively use our Food For Peace program.

In 1962, I was privileged as a U. S. delegate, to propose the Food for Freedom program which the U. N. Food and Agriculture Organization adopted and now conducts. It is relatively small, compared to need, but it is a beginning at multi-lateral participation in a War Against Hunger.

In 1966 this Nation made another landmark decision on the road to an intelligent, common sense world food policy when the Congress removed the limitations which heretofore had confined our Food For Peace efforts to surplus disposal and authorized for the first time the deliberate production of food to help meet the needs of the food deficit countries of the world. We also very substantially increased the dollar authorizations in the new Food For Peace Act of 1966. The importance of those actions, of course, will now depend on the skill and the wisdom, with which they are implemented.

President Johnson has recently underlined, and I think on good grounds, the need for other Nations with a surplus food capacity to join with us in assisting the hunger areas of the world. If a nation cannot donate food, perhaps it can provide some other aid to help meet the food needs of less developed parts of the world. As the President said in his Food For Freedom message to Congress early last year, we must go beyond dealing with spectacular emergencies and deal with the invisible, silent hunger, the chronic malnutrition, which claims the lives of some 3 million children every year, cripples other millions of children both mentally and physically, and so saps the energy of whole nations that hunger is the chief barrier to economic and social development, and perhaps to political stability in the world.

We are going to have to do what we can within the limit of our resources, within reason, to eliminate the causes of malnutrition. Those causes can be eliminated in a world which has both the resources and the know-how to balance food production and population growth.

Dealing with the causes, and with the rising food and population crisis, requires 4 steps.

First of all, we and other advanced nations must gear our food production to mounting world food needs to prevent starvation and to assist the developing countries to increase their own food producing capacity.

Secondly, we must encourage the food deficit countries to strengthen their own food handling and food distribution facilities, including their ports, their storage capacity, their processing and distribution facilities so that additional food coming in from outside or accumulations of food in certain parts of their own countries can be moved efficiently and protected for proper use in areas of need.

Thirdly, we must stimulate in every reason-

able way greater attention and investment in rural development and food production in the emerging countries. That is a high priority item in the Food For Peace Act of 1966.

Fourth, we must encourage and assist as best we can more effective population control measures in the developing world. Here again, that is one of the high priority purposes embodied in the Food For Peace Act of 1966.

The War Against Hunger will not be won, of course, by giving arbitrary orders in any of those areas and abandoning people who have difficulty complying immediately with the criteria that we seek to lay down. Social change comes very slowly in any society and it is especially difficult to impose from the outside. We are discovering that in our own country. For example, even a great, enlightened country such as the United States might have great difficulty meeting a requirement that we end crime in our own streets as a condition of qualifying for membership in the world community. It might take a little time to accomplish that desirable purpose. The South Vietnamese, with over 100,000 army desertions annually, have not been able to meet the original criteria that we laid down as a condition for substantial American military support in their effort. Nonetheless, we have not terminated our aid to them, and we cannot expect countries that are faced with 90 percent or more illiteracy, with religious taboos, with land tenure problems, with a primitive tax structure and underdeveloped economy to transform their agriculture in four or five years. We can't expect less developed countries to be able to respond as rapidly as we do to new technology. Even in this relatively enlightened country of ours, it sometimes takes public incentives and a good many years to accomplish reforms that we recognize are needed. Forty years after Hugh Bennett's first eye-opening report on soil erosion, for instance, we still have only about one-third of our farmland under permanent conservation practices.

The War On Hunger is going to take patience and persistence. It cannot be won in a year or in a few years. We are not going to get immediate acceptance of all of the desirable criteria that we seek. But if it is won, and I am convinced it can be, this war will return big dividends to the people of the United States, even in terms of dollar resources for this country, as well as in terms of peace and security.

The State University of South Dakota at Brookings has conducted a preliminary study to determine what would be the impact on the economy of our State if we could bring diverted farmland back into cultivation—land which has been taken out under various crop control programs in recent years—and then find a useful outlet at a fair price for the producers. It was concluded that in our State alone the full use of our productive capacity would increase income \$240 million each year. That study did not take into account the increased transportation, machinery, gasoline and other business that would flow beyond our state boundaries. That kind of impact from a War Against Hunger will be felt across the whole American economy as we move to meet the challenge.

The provision of know-how to the less developed countries is a task of government, of our agricultural education institutions and of private business. It must be done if hunger is finally to be eliminated, for the United States cannot feed the world. Every productive acre on the planet will be needed in production before food and population can be brought into balance. I join with those who hope that we will be able to find more effective ways to enlist private American business in this effort. These businesses can provide not only the salesmen-educators, capital, and agribusiness know-how, but

they can demonstrate the effectiveness of our system of freedom to the emerging countries which have yet to determine the kind of political arrangements under which they are finally going to live.

Our great concern, it seems to me, must be with doing a better job of marshalling our resources and our know-how to meet this greatest challenge of our times.

I look forward, as I know my colleagues in the Congress do, to working with you to meet both domestic and world challenges. Victory in the War Against Hunger is, in my judgment, the most important enterprise of our time.

AT ARLINGTON TODAY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we have buried "Gus" Grissom today.

He lies in Arlington with our men of many wars.

Beside him, and all about this first astronaut, are the men who know him best; those who have died before him in the service of his country.

They will know him as a youngster in Mitchell, Ind., who gazed at the stars and became one with them.

They will know him as Lt. Col. Virgil I. Grissom, U.S. Air Force, space age pioneer, who has died in his country's service.

Lieutenant Colonel Grissom was one of the seven Mercury astronauts selected by NASA in April 1959. He piloted the Liberty Bell 7 spacecraft—the second and final suborbital Mercury test flight—on July 21, 1961. This flight lasted 15 minutes and 37 seconds, attained an altitude of 118 statute miles, and traveled 302 miles downrange from the launch pad at Cape Kennedy.

On March 23, 1965, he served as command pilot on the first manned Gemini flight, a three-orbit mission during which the crew accomplished the first orbital trajectory modifications and the first lifting reentry of a manned spacecraft. Subsequent to this assignment, he served as backup command pilot for Gemini 6.

He died as command pilot for the first three-man Apollo flight—Apollo 1.

We, the living, have known him for his courage and his leadership in circumstances unprecedented in man's exploration of the unknown. Our State of Indiana joins in saluting a man among us who has served his country well.

UNITED STATES-SOVIET CONSULAR CONVENTION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I speak in behalf of the United States-Soviet Consular Convention. I do so in the firm belief that the Senate should advise and consent to the ratification of this important agreement.

I am not unaware of the opposition to this convention. In my own office, some 100 letters and telegrams have been received. Many, citing publications of the Liberty Lobby and other groups, express fears of Communist subversion and infiltration.

Now I do not, for one moment, question that these are legitimate areas for concern, but I do question whether their relevance to the ratification of this convention is properly understood. I cannot escape the conclusion that much of the opposition to ratification stems simply

January 31, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 1167

from misunderstanding of the question we are being asked to decide. For the record, it seems relevant, once more, to review what this convention will and will not do.

The Consular Convention does not require, authorize, or propose the opening of a single Soviet consulate in the United States, or a single U.S. consulate in the Soviet Union.

Should a consulate be opened in the United States and one opened at, say, Leningrad, the opening of such a consulate would not extend the security burdens of the FBI to cover more than an additional 15 persons, which hardly seems enough to justify the current ruckus surrounding this controversy.

This convention does not, by itself, permit the Soviets to send a single additional person to this country, nor does it permit us to send anyone to the U.S.S.R. Since, under the Constitution, the President can agree to the reciprocal opening of consulates in the United States and a foreign country at any time, approval of the convention has no bearing on this question.

What this convention does do, however, is to say to the Soviets that if additional consulates are to be opened—and this could be done only on a reciprocal basis and as the result of specific negotiations for this purpose—then this convention says to the Soviets that certain ground rules will be followed. What these ground rules represent is a legal framework to make possible important forward steps in the field of consular protection and services.

First, the convention guarantees immediate notification by the receiving state to the consular offices of the sending state in the event that one of the citizens of the sending state is arrested. The term, "immediate" is defined in the convention to mean from 1 to 3 days.

Secondly, the convention provides for access to any arrested citizen without delay. The convention specifies that "without delay" is to be within 2 to 4 days. Furthermore, it is provided that this access is to be granted on a continuing basis.

Finally, the convention differs from earlier consular conventions in that it provides full immunity for all consular officers and employees from the criminal jurisdiction of the receiving state. Without such immunity for our consular personnel in the Soviet Union, they would serve there under a constant threat of being the victims of false charges in reprisal for action taken by this country when Soviet personnel are, in fact, found to be engaged in espionage activities. The temptation to act against American consular personnel serving in the Soviet Union without diplomatic immunity would be eliminated.

The case for ratification would not be complete if it did not take cognizance of the estimated 18,000 Americans who travel annually in the Soviet Union.

I might add that this number has grown from 5,000 to 18,000 in the last few years. The number of Soviets traveling in this country is estimated as being between 700 and 900 persons. In the Consular Convention, for those accused of crimes, we have an opportunity to af-

ford protections of access to American consular personnel never before possible in the Soviet Union. Even the Soviet citizens in their own country enjoy no such right. They are held incommunicado until the investigation of a criminal is completed, and this can take many months. Yet, with this Convention, Americans would be guaranteed notification and access rights not previously allowed. For myself, I would not want to feel that I had not taken every step possible to guarantee the safety of these Americans assigned or traveling abroad.

We come then to the real issue before us—have we an obligation to provide better tools for the protection of Americans in the U.S.S.R.? My intended vote for ratification indicates my belief that the answer clearly is "Yes."

Mr. President, there is another point. The Office of the Legal Adviser of the Department of State on July 7, 1964, wrote a letter to me. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Robert E. Lee, Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., July 7, 1964.

HON. HUGH SCOTT,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SCOTT: Thank you for your letter of June 26, in which you asked for a statement from the office of the Department's Legal Adviser on what legal effect, if any, the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Consular Convention, which was signed on June 1, 1964, would have on the United States' nonrecognition of the Soviet takeover of the Baltic States of Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania, and on our recognition of the representatives of the last free governments of these countries.

The office of the Legal Adviser confirms that the Consular Convention, if it is ratified and enters into force, would have no effect on our consistent and emphatic refusal to recognize the illegal annexation of Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania by the Soviet Government, or on our continued recognition of the diplomatic and consular representatives of the last free governments of those countries.

A copy of the Convention is enclosed. If the Department can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. LEE,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

Enclosure:
Consular Convention Text.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the legal adviser of the Department of State in the letter addressed to me on July 7, 1964, assured me that if the convention is ratified it "would have no effect on our consistent and emphatic refusal to recognize the illegal annexation of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania by the Soviet Government, or on our continued recognition of the diplomatic and consular representatives of the last free governments of those countries."

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the text of the consular convention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I would like to point out something here. What

has been lost sight of is the fact that 18,000 Americans go to the Soviet Union each year. Nine hundred Russians come here. The addition of a consulate adds 15 people, which does not, to my mind, greatly increase the security risk, but we have constituents traveling in Russia all the time. We also have constituents who are employees of the Foreign Service. Immunity presently extends to the people who work for the embassies. The consul, the minister, all have immunity. The stenographer has no immunity at all unless we have such a convention. The security aspects are worse now than if we were to ratify the convention because that stenographer or a file clerk could be blackmailed, held incommunicado, and sent to Siberia for 9 months, while the boss could not. Moreover, a traveler over there, a constituent of mine, could be held there for 9 months.

Under this convention he would have more rights than Soviet citizens. He would be entitled to a lawyer, and entitled to be sprung from the pokey in 3 days. Who is more likely to be stuck in the pokey: 18,000 Americans traveling over there or 900 Russians over here?

Mr. President, a Soviet citizen who is stuck in the pokey in this country has the benefit of all of the protection of the laws of the United States. Here he has the sanctuary which our laws provide and which our courts guarantee. He has the right of a trial by jury, he has the right to demand an attorney, he has the right to be confronted by his accusers, and he has the right of indictment. In other words, he has the right of every American in this country.

Americans in the Soviet Union have none of those rights. It will be recalled that Newcomb Mott, who allegedly committed suicide, may well have gone to his end out of the frustrations of being held incommunicado in a Soviet prison which prevented our Embassy people from having the opportunity to secure for him the rights which this convention would guarantee.

Mr. President, I am not going to be moved by the Liberty Lobby, and I am not going to be moved by the nervous Nellies or hysterical people who yell, "Communist danger" every time we try to do something which reasonably enables us to protect our own people. For this reason I am concerned about my constituents. I do not want them in a Russian pokey, and I want them to have every right that this treaty would guarantee. The odds are 20-to-1 that we are more likely to need this convention than they are, and those are pretty good odds, even in Las Vegas. Certainly they are pretty good odds when a treaty is being written.

EXHIBIT 1

CONSULAR CONVENTION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of the United States of America,

Desiring to cooperate in strengthening friendly relations and to regulate consular relations between both states,

Have decided to conclude a consular convention and for this purpose have agreed on the following:

DEFINITIONS

Article 1

For the purpose of the present Convention, the terms introduced hereunder have the following meaning:

- 1) "Consular establishment"—means any consulate general, consulate, vice consulate or consular agency;
- 2) "Consular District"—means the area assigned to a consular establishment for the exercise of consular functions;
- 3) "Head of consular establishment"—means a consul general, consul, vice consul, or consular agent directing the consular establishment;
- 4) "Consular officer"—means any person, including the head of the consular establishment, entrusted with the exercise of consular functions. Also included in the definition of "consular officer" are persons assigned to the consular establishment for training in the consular service.
- 5) "Employee of the consular establishment"—means any person performing administrative, technical, or service functions in a consular establishment.

OPENING OF CONSULAR ESTABLISHMENTS, APPOINTMENT OF CONSULAR OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Article 2

1. A consular establishment may be opened in the territory of the receiving state only with that state's consent.
 2. The location of a consular establishment and the limits of its consular district will be determined by agreement between the sending and receiving states.
 3. Prior to the appointment of a head of a consular establishment, the sending state shall obtain the approval of the receiving state to such an appointment through diplomatic channels.
 4. The diplomatic mission of the sending state shall transmit to the Foreign Affairs Ministry of the receiving state a consular commission which shall contain the full name of the head of the consular establishment his citizenship, his class, the consular district assigned to him, and the seat of the consular establishment.
 5. A head of a consular establishment may enter upon the exercises of his duties only after having been recognized in this capacity by the receiving state. Such recognition after the presentation of the commission shall be in the form of an exequatur or in another form and shall be free of charge.
 6. The full name, function and class of all consular officers other than the head of a consular establishment, and the full name and function of employees of the consular establishment shall be notified in advance by the sending state to the receiving state.
- The receiving state shall issue to each consular officer an appropriate document confirming his right to carry out consular functions in the territory of the receiving state.
7. The receiving state may at any time, and without having to explain its decision, notify the sending state through diplomatic channels that any consular officer is persona non grata or that any employee of the consular establishment is unacceptable. In such a case the sending state shall accordingly recall such officer or employee of the consular establishment. If the sending state refuses or fails within a reasonable time to carry out its obligations under the present paragraph, the receiving state may refuse to recognize the officer or employee concerned as a member of the consular establishment.
 8. With the exception of members of the staff of the diplomatic mission of the sending state, as defined in Paragraph c of Article 1 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, no national of the sending state already present in the receiving state or in transit thereto may be appointed as a consular officer or employee of the consular establishment.

Article 3

Consular officers may be nationals only of the sending state.

Article 4

The receiving state shall take the necessary measures in order that a consular officer may carry out his duties and enjoy the rights, privileges, and immunities provided for in the present Convention and by the laws of the receiving state.

Article 5

1. The receiving state shall either facilitate the acquisition on its territory, in accordance with its laws and regulations, by the sending state of premises necessary for its consular establishment or assist the latter in obtaining accommodation in some other way.
2. It shall also, where necessary, assist the sending state in obtaining suitable accommodation for the personnel of its consular establishment.

Article 6

1. If the head of the consular establishment cannot carry out his functions or if the position of head of a consular establishment is vacant, the sending state may empower a consular officer of the same or another consular establishment, or one of the members of the diplomatic staff of its diplomatic mission in the receiving state, to act temporarily as head of the consular establishment. The full name of this person must be transmitted in advance to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the receiving state.
2. A person empowered to act as temporary head of the consular establishment shall enjoy the rights, privileges and immunities of the head of the consular establishment.
3. When, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of the present Article, a member of the diplomatic staff of the diplomatic mission of the sending state in the receiving state is designated by the sending state as an acting head of the consular establishment, he shall continue to enjoy diplomatic privileges and immunities.

CONSULAR FUNCTIONS

Article 7

- A consular officer shall be entitled within his consular district to perform the following functions, and for this purpose may apply orally or in writing to the competent authorities of the consular district:
1. To protect the rights and interests of the sending state and its nationals, both individuals and bodies corporate;
 2. To further the development of commercial, economic, cultural and scientific relations between the sending state and the receiving state and otherwise promote the development of friendly relations between them;
 3. To register nationals of the sending state, to issue or amend passports and other certificates of identity, and also to issue entry, exit, and transit visas;
 4. To draw up and record certificates of birth and death of citizens of the sending state taking place in the receiving state, to record marriages and divorces, if both persons entering into marriage or divorce are citizens of the sending state, and also to receive such declarations pertaining to family relationships of a national of the sending state as may be required under the law of the sending state, unless prohibited by the laws of the receiving state;
 5. To draw up, certify, attest, authenticate, legalize and take other actions which might be necessary to validate any act or document of a legal character, as well as copies thereof, including commercial documents, declarations, registrations, testamentary dispositions, and contracts, upon the application of a national of the sending state, when such document is intended for use outside the territory of the receiving state, and also for any person, when such document is intended for use in the territory of the sending state;
 6. To translate any acts and documents

into the Russian and English languages and to certify to the accuracy of the translations;

7. To perform other official consular functions entrusted to him by the sending state if they are not contrary to the laws of the receiving state.

Article 8

1. The acts and documents specified in Paragraph 5 of Article 7 of the present Convention which are drawn up or certified by the consular officer with his official seal affixed, as well as copies, extracts, and translations of such acts and documents certified by him with his official seal affixed, shall be receivable in evidence in the receiving state as official or officially certified acts, documents, copies, translations, or extracts, and shall have the same force and effect as though they were drawn up or certified by the competent authorities or officials of the receiving state; provided that such documents shall have been drawn and executed in conformity with the laws and regulations of the country where they are designed to take effect.

2. The acts, documents, copies, translations, or extracts, enumerated in paragraph 1 of the present Article shall be authenticated if required by the laws of the receiving state when they are presented to the authorities of the receiving state.

Article 9

If the relevant information is available to the competent authorities of the receiving state, such authorities shall inform the consular establishment of the death of a national of the sending state.

Article 10

1. In the case of the death of a national of the sending state in the territory of the receiving state, without leaving in the territory of his decease any known heir or testamentary executor, the appropriate local authorities of the receiving state shall as promptly as possible inform a consular officer of the sending state.

2. A consular officer of the sending state may, within the discretion of the appropriate judicial authorities and if permissible under then existing applicable local law in the receiving state:

- a) take provisional custody of the personal property left by a deceased national of the sending state, provided that the decedent shall have left in the receiving state no heir or testamentary executor appointed by the decedent to take care of his personal estate; provided that such provisional custody shall be relinquished to a duly appointed administrator;
- b) administer the estate of a deceased national of the sending state who is not a resident of the receiving state at the time of his death, who leaves no testamentary executor, and who leaves in the receiving state no heir, provided that if authorized to administer the estate, the consular officer shall relinquish such administration upon the appointment of another administrator;
- c) represent the interests of a national of the sending state in an estate in the receiving state, provided that such national is not a resident of the receiving state, unless or until such national is otherwise represented; provided, however, that nothing herein shall authorize a consular officer to act as an attorney at law.

3. Unless prohibited by law, a consular officer may, within the discretion of the court, agency, or person making distribution, receive for transmission to a national of the sending state who is not a resident of the receiving state any money or property to which such national is entitled as a consequence of the death of another person, including shares in an estate, payments made pursuant to workmen's compensation laws, pension and social-benefits systems in general, and proceeds of insurance policies.

The court, agency, or person making distribution may require that a consular officer

comply with conditions laid down with regard to: (a) presenting a power of attorney or other authorization from such non-resident national, (b) furnishing reasonable evidence of the receipt of such money or property by such national, and (c) returning the money or property in the event he is unable to furnish such evidence.

4. Whenever a consular officer shall perform the functions referred to in paragraph 2 and 3 of this Article, he shall be subject, with respect to the exercise of such functions, to the laws of the receiving state and to the civil jurisdiction of the judicial and administrative authorities of the receiving state in the same manner and to the same extent as a national of the receiving state.

Article 11

A consular officer may recommend to the courts or to other competent authorities of the receiving state appropriate persons to act in the capacity of guardians or trustees for citizens of the sending state or for the property of such citizens when this property is left without supervision.

In the event that the court or competent authorities consider that the recommended candidate is for some reason unacceptable, the consular officer may propose a new candidate.

Article 12

1. A consular officer shall have the right within his district to meet with, communicate with, assist, and advise any national of the sending state and, where necessary, arrange for legal assistance for him. The receiving state shall in no way restrict the access of nationals of the sending state to its Consular establishments.

2. The appropriate authorities of the receiving state shall immediately inform a consular officer of the sending state about the arrest or detention in other form of a national of the sending state.

3. A consular officer of the sending state shall have the right without delay to visit and communicate with a national of the sending state who is under arrest or otherwise detained in custody or is serving a sentence of imprisonment. The rights referred to in this paragraph shall be exercised in conformity with the laws and regulations of the receiving state, subject to the proviso, however, that the said laws and regulations must not nullify these rights.

Article 13

1. A consular officer may provide aid and assistance to vessels registered under the flag of the sending state which have entered a port in his consular district.

2. Without prejudice to the powers of the receiving state, a consular officer may conduct investigations into any incidents which occurred during the voyage on vessels registered under the flag of the sending state, and may settle disputes of any kind between the master, the officers and the seamen insofar as this may be authorized by the laws of the sending state. A consular officer may request the assistance of the competent authorities of the receiving state in the performance of such duties.

3. In the event that the courts or other competent authorities of the receiving state intend to take any coercive action on vessels registered under the flag of the sending state while they are located in the waters of the receiving state, the competent authorities of the receiving state shall, unless it is impractical to do so in view of the urgency of the matter, inform a consular officer of the sending state prior to initiating such action so that the consular officer may be present when the action is taken. Whenever it is impractical to notify a consular officer in advance, the competent authorities of the receiving state shall inform him as soon as possible thereafter of the action taken.

4. Paragraph 3 of this Article shall not apply to customs, passport, and sanitary

inspections, or to action taken at the request or with the approval of the master of the vessel.

5. The term "vessel", as used in the present Convention, does not include warships.

Article 14

If a vessel registered under the flag of the sending state suffers shipwreck, runs aground, is swept ashore, or suffers any other accident whatever within the territorial limits of the receiving state, the competent authorities of the receiving state shall immediately inform a consular officer and advise him of the measures which they have taken to rescue persons, vessel, and cargo.

The consular officer may provide all kinds of assistance to such a vessel, the members of its crew, and its passengers, as well as take measures in connection with the preservation of the cargo and repair of the ship, or he may request the authorities of the receiving state to take such measures.

The competent authorities of the receiving state shall render the necessary assistance to the consular officer in measures taken by him in connection with the accident to the vessel.

No customs duties shall be levied against a wrecked vessel, its cargo or stores, in the territory of the receiving state, unless they are delivered for use in that state.

If the owner or anyone authorized to act for him is unable to make necessary arrangements in connection with the vessel or its cargo, the consular officer may make such arrangements. The consular officer may under similar circumstances make arrangements in connection with cargo owned by the sending state or any of its nationals and found or brought into port from a wrecked vessel registered under the flag of any state except a vessel of the receiving state.

Article 15

Articles 13 and 14, respectively, shall also apply to aircraft.

RIGHTS, PRIVILEGES, AND IMMUNITIES

Article 16

The national flag of the sending state and the consular flag may be flown at the consular establishment, at the residence of the head of the consular establishment, and on his means of transport used by him in the performance of his official duties. The shield with the national coat-of-arms of the sending state and the name of the establishment may also be affixed on the building in which the consular establishment is located.

Article 17

The consular archives shall be inviolable at all times and wherever they may be. Unofficial papers shall not be kept in the consular archives.

The buildings or parts of buildings and the land ancillary thereto, used for the purposes of the consular establishment and the residence of the head of the consular establishment, shall be inviolable.

The police and other authorities of the receiving state may not enter the building or that part of the building which is used for the purposes of the consular establishment or the residence of the head of the consular establishment without the consent of the head thereof, persons appointed by him, or the head of the diplomatic mission of the sending state.

Article 18

1. The consular establishment shall have the right to communicate with its Government, with the diplomatic mission and the consular establishments of the sending state in the receiving state, or with other diplomatic missions and consular establishments of the sending state, making use of all ordinary means of communication. In such communications, the consular establishment shall have the right to use code, diplomatic couriers, and the diplomatic pouch. The same fees shall apply to consular establish-

ments in the use of ordinary means of communication as apply to the diplomatic mission of the sending state.

2. The official correspondence of a consular establishment, regardless of what means of communication are used, and the sealed diplomatic pouch bearing visible external marks of its official character, shall be inviolable and not subject to examination or detention by the authorities of the receiving state.

Article 19

1. Consular officers shall not be subject to the jurisdiction of the receiving state in matters relating to their official activity. The same applies to employees of the consular establishment, if they are nationals of the sending state.

2. Consular officers and employees of the consular establishment who are nationals of the sending state shall enjoy immunity from the criminal jurisdiction of the receiving state.

3. This immunity from the criminal jurisdiction of the receiving state of consular officers and employees of the consular establishment of the sending state may be waived by the sending state. Waiver must always be express.

Article 20

1. Consular officers and employees of the consular establishment, on the invitation of a court of the receiving state, shall appear in court for witness testimony. Taking measures to compel a consular officer or an employee of the consular establishment who is a national of the sending state to appear in court as a witness and to give witness testimony is not permissible.

2. If a consular officer or an employee of the consular establishment who is a national of the sending state for official reasons or for reasons considered valid according to the laws of the receiving state cannot appear in court, he shall inform the court thereof and give witness testimony on the premises of the consular establishment or in his own abode.

3. Whenever under the laws of the receiving state an oath is required to be taken in court by consular officers and employees of the consular establishment, an affirmation shall be accepted in lieu thereof.

4. Consular officers and employees of the consular establishment may refuse to give witness testimony on facts relating to their official activity.

5. The provisions of paragraphs 1, 2, 3, & 4 shall also apply to proceedings conducted by administrative authorities.

Article 21

1. Immovable property, situated in the territory of the receiving state, of which the sending state or one or more persons acting in its behalf is the owner or lessee and which is used for diplomatic or consular purposes, including residences for personnel attached to the diplomatic and consular establishments, shall be exempt from taxation of any kind imposed by the receiving state or any of its states or local governments other than such as represent payments for specific services rendered.

2. The exemption from taxation referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article shall not apply to such charges, duties, and taxes if, under the law of the receiving states, they are payable by the person who contracted with the sending state or with the person acting on its behalf.

Article 22

A consular officer or employee of a consular establishment, who is not a national of the receiving state and who does not have the status in the receiving state of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, shall be exempt from the payment of all taxes or similar charges of any kind imposed by the receiving state or any of its states or local governments on official emoluments, salaries, wages, or allowances received by such officer

or employee from the sending state in connection with the discharge of his official functions.

Article 23

1. A consular officer or employee of a consular establishment who is not a national of the receiving state and who does not have the status in the receiving state of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, shall, except as provided in paragraph 2 of this Article, be exempt from the payment of all taxes or similar charges of any kind imposed by the receiving state or any of its states or local governments, for the payment of which the officer or employee of the consular establishment would otherwise be legally liable.

2. The exemption from taxes or charges provided in paragraph 1 of this Article does not apply in respect to taxes or charges upon:

a) The acquisition or possession of private immovable property located in the receiving state if the persons referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article do not own or lease this property on the behalf of the sending state for the purposes of the consular establishment;

b) Income received from sources in the receiving state other than as described in Article 22 of the present Convention.

c) The transfer by gift of property in the receiving state;

d) The transfer at death, including by inheritance, of property in the receiving state.

3. However, the exemption from taxes or similar charges provided in paragraph 1 of this Article, applies in respect to movable inherited property left after the death of a consular officer or employee of the consular establishment or a member of his family residing with him if they are not nationals of the receiving state or aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence, and if the property was located in the receiving state exclusively in connection with the sojourn in this state of the deceased as a consular officer or employee of the consular establishment or member of his family residing with him.

Article 24

A consular officer or employee of a consular establishment and members of his family residing with him, who are not nationals of the receiving state and who do not have the status in the receiving state of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence, shall be exempt in the receiving state from service in the armed forces and from all other types of compulsory service.

Article 25

A consular officer or employee of a consular establishment and members of his family residing with him who do not have the status in the receiving state of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence, shall be exempt from all obligations under the laws and regulations of the receiving state with regard to the registration of aliens, and obtaining permission to reside, and from compliance with other similar requirements applicable to aliens.

Article 26

1. The same full exemption from customs duties and internal revenue or other taxes imposed upon or by reason of importation shall apply in the receiving state to all articles, including motor vehicles, imported exclusively for the official use of a consular establishment, as apply to articles imported for the official use of the diplomatic mission of the sending state.

2. Consular officers, and employees of the consular establishment, and members of their families residing with them, who are not nationals of the receiving state, and who do not have the status in the receiving state of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence, shall be granted, on the basis of reciprocity, the same exemptions from cus-

toms duties and internal revenue or other taxes imposed upon or by reason of importation, as are granted to corresponding personnel of the diplomatic mission of the sending state.

3. For the purpose of paragraph two of this Article the term "corresponding personnel of the diplomatic mission" refers to members of the diplomatic staff in the case of consular officers, and to members of the administrative and technical staff in the case of employees of a consular establishment.

Article 27

Subject to the laws and regulations of the receiving state concerning zones entry into which is prohibited or regulated for reasons of national security, a consular officer shall be permitted to travel freely within the limits of his consular district to carry out his official duties.

Article 28

Without prejudice to their privileges and immunities, it is the duty of all persons enjoying such privileges and immunities to respect the laws and regulations of the receiving state, including traffic regulations.

Article 29

1. The rights and obligations of consular officers provided for in the present Convention also apply to members of the diplomatic staff of the diplomatic mission of the Contracting Parties charged with the performance of consular functions in the diplomatic mission and who have been notified in a consular capacity to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the receiving state by the diplomatic mission.

2. Except as provided in paragraph 4 of Article 10 of the present Convention, the performance of consular functions by the persons referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article shall not affect the diplomatic privileges and immunities granted to them as members of the diplomatic mission.

FINAL PROVISIONS

Article 30

1. The present Convention shall be subject to ratification and shall enter into force on the thirtieth day following the exchange of instruments of ratification, which shall take place in Washington as soon as possible.

2. The Convention shall remain in force until six months from the date on which one of the Contracting Parties informs the other Contracting Party of its desire to terminate its validity.

In witness whereof the Plenipotentiaries of the two Contracting Parties have signed the present Convention and affixed their seals thereto.

Done in Moscow on June 1, 1964, in two copies, each in the Russian and the English language, both texts being equally authentic.

For the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic.

For the Government of the United States of America.

PROTOCOL TO THE CONSULAR CONVENTION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNION OF THE SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

1. It is agreed between the Contracting Parties that the notification of a consular officer of the arrest or detention in other form of a national of the sending state specified in paragraph 2 of Article 12 of the Consular Convention between the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of the United States of America of June 1, 1964, shall take place within one to three days from the time of arrest or detention depending on conditions of communication.

2. It is agreed between the Contracting Parties that the rights specified in paragraph

3 of Article 12 of the Consular Convention of a consular officer to visit and communicate with a national of the sending state who is under arrest or otherwise detained in custody shall be accorded within two to four days of the arrest or detention of such national depending upon his location.

3. It is agreed between the Contracting Parties that the rights specified in paragraph 3 of Article 12 of the Consular Convention of a consular officer to visit and communicate with a national of the sending state who is under arrest or otherwise detained in custody or is serving a sentence of imprisonment shall be accorded on a continuing basis.

The present Protocol constitutes an integral part of the Consular Convention between the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of the United States of America of June 1, 1964.

Done at Moscow on June 1, 1964, in two copies, each in the Russian and the English language, both texts being equally authentic.

For the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

For the Government of the United States of America.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] has taken the floor this morning to expound his views on the proposed consular treaty and to indicate the reasons why he supports it.

I would point out that this treaty was initiated by the United States in the latter years of the Eisenhower administration. I would point out furthermore that what we get out of this treaty is equal protection for our citizens in the Soviet Union and we give them a chance to be protected; whereas, now Soviet citizens here get such protection automatically under American law. Actually this treaty would place American citizens attached to the embassies in the Soviet Union on a better footing than Soviet citizens themselves. As the Senator stated it might be that had this treaty been in effect at the time of Malcolm Mott, Malcolm Mott might still be alive today.

Mr. President, there is one other thing that should be brought up. Great Britain and Japan have entered into consular agreements with the Soviet Union, which apply not only to consular staffs but also to their families. Those agreements go far beyond this proposal which I think is overwhelmingly in our favor, because, as the Senator from Pennsylvania noted succinctly and pointedly there are 20 times as many U.S. citizens visiting in the Soviet Union as there are Soviet citizens visiting in this Nation. Why should we place our citizens under a handicap? Why should we not give our people some degree of diplomatic protection so they will not be put in the "pokey," as the Senator from Pennsylvania stated, with no recourse under Soviet law, and where they could be held for 9 months without anybody knowing about it.

Mr. President, I thoroughly support the Senator from Pennsylvania in what he had to say and I hope this proposal

will be considered on the basis of its merits and not on the basis of pressure groups, whether they are domestic or tied to foreign countries. This is a matter in the national interest which affects American citizens, and they are entitled to the protection which is sought in the treaty. I hope that the Senate, on the basis of logic, reason, and national interest alone will see that they get that protection as the Senator indicated.

Mr. SCOTT. I want to thank the Senator and point out how often those who are extremists on either end defeat their own cause—

Mr. MANSFIELD. And hurt our country.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes—the extremists on the far right who deliberately lobby in this country with what I call their tunnel vision are actually serving the cause of the left, which they do not intend to do, but that is what happens when they get too far on the edge and forget that the world is round and end up on the other side of the argument.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think it is about time someone made the statement which has just been made by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I will have to say that a month ago I had not given too serious consideration to the proposal for a consular treaty between the United States and Russia. However, during the past few days, I have been deluged by professionally inspired hate mail. Obviously, this is organization mail which has been promoted by what I believe to be well-paid agitators who may have collected money from those who came to America from other countries to seek freedom. Perhaps not. Perhaps they got it from other sources. But, certainly, this is a professional job that is being done on Congress at this time. So far as I am concerned, it is ineffective.

I have made up my mind that I will support this consular treaty if for no other reason than to tell these professional agitators that they are not going to run this country if I can help it.

Perhaps these people help out at election time by rounding up votes. I do not know about that for sure. Maybe they contribute more or less to certainly what they consider to be meritorious organizations. But, I do believe that when they come to this country, it is up to them to accept the rules and regulations of America and not spend their time agitating hate against the countries from which they came.

I realize that this consular treaty is a treaty with Russia and Russia at this time is certainly not entitled to special consideration on our part. I expect there are people from old world countries who are very much interested in thwarting this treaty, for one purpose or another.

I want to thank the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] for putting this subject in its proper light. It is time those folks find out that they cannot come to America and flout our regulations and our traditions, or break our laws and agitate continually for war and violence in other parts of the world and have their actions endorsed by the U.S. Senate.

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad the majority leader has pointed out the fact that the

British and the Japanese have more favorable agreements with Russia than the one we are proposing. This finds us lagging in that regard.

I have also been somewhat concerned over the argument which, on its face, would seem to have merit, that we cannot trust the Russians to keep a treaty.

On this point, I inquired of those in whom I have confidence, and the answer is that there are various remedies the United States can take if it finds any violation of the consular convention, as with any other treaty.

One, the United States can declare the person in violation to be persona non grata and can kick him out of the country.

Two, we can kick their consulate out, as happened when the Russians had a consulate in New York, and they then withdrew their consulates in San Francisco and New Orleans.

Three, we can denounce the convention if they have not lived up to it.

Thus, there are at least three methods to protect the security of the United States.

I therefore am not convinced by the argument that the Russians will not keep this convention. It is to their interests to keep it.

Finally, I belong to the organization known as the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations. None of us in the Senate has to establish his anti-Communist credentials. None of us has to establish the fact that he is security conscious in the Senate. But, I see nothing wrong in doing something which will mutually benefit the United States and the Government of the Soviet Union at a time when the Government of China is only semixistent. That would be a reason to be glad we have done something in our own interest, even though it requires us to deal with the second largest nation in the world at a time when the first largest nation in the world is in one heck of a state. Thus, I am not too much concerned. Communism has plenty of problems of its own. I am concerned only with the security of the United States and that is why I support this consular convention.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I agree fully with what the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the ranking Republican Member in this body, has just said. There is no room for a double loyalty in this country. You are either a citizen or you are not; you either aspire to American citizenship or you do not. I think that should be kept in mind at all times.

I also point out that there seems to be an impression going around that a number of consulates in both countries will be opened. The fact is, only one is even under consideration, as to the time to set it up, if the protocol agreement is ratified. Even if the agreement is not ratified, the President has the power to allow a consulate to be set up in this country or to arrange to open one abroad. If he did it under a reciprocal basis, without this treaty, our consulates in the Soviet Union would have to operate under Soviet law and would be denied the diplomatic protection to which any American operating in that

category should get. I hope that the Senate will see to it that this is done and Americans working in the Soviet Union get the protection to which they are entitled.

Mr. SCOTT. Would not the Senator agree that we cannot stand for a double standard where an employer in the Foreign Service, rather than the Soviet Union, has certain immunities which his secretary and his file clerk do not possess.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Exactly.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT PAYMENTS TO FARMERS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have just noticed on the ticker, on the Associated Press, outside the Senate Chamber, a release from the Department of Agriculture showing the amounts of payments made by that Department to farmers in 1966 for complying with its programs.

The amount of the payments totaled a record high of \$3.27 billion compared to \$2.45 billion in 1965.

The contents of this release are a matter of great importance and one for grave consideration by the Senate. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the item from the Associated Press ticker printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM PAYMENTS

WASHINGTON (AP).—The Agriculture Department today reported Government payments made to farmers in 1966 for complying with its programs totaled a record \$3.27 billion compared to \$2.45 billion in 1965.

The payments included \$1.29 billion for the feed grain program compared with \$1.39 billion in 1965; \$786 million compared with \$70 million for the cotton program; \$683 million compared with \$525 million for the wheat program; \$224 million compared with \$215 million for the conservation payment program; \$135 million compared with \$160 million for the soil bank land retirement program; \$61 million compared with \$64 million for the sugar program; \$34 million compared with \$18 million for wool incentive payments; and \$44 million compared with none for the new cropland adjustment program.

The department also reported farm prices in 1966 averaged 80 per cent of the parity price goal of farm programs compared with 77 per cent in 1965.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Can the Senator explain why the amount has increased by almost 33 1/3 percent?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, I think I can. Perhaps it would tend to explain my answer if I read the amounts in the various programs.

The release from the Department of Agriculture shows that for the feed grains program, the amount for 1966 went down from the year before only slightly—that is, from \$1.39 billion to \$1.29 billion.

For the cotton program, it went up exceedingly high, to \$786 million compared with only \$70 million the year be-

fore, showing an increase of over \$700 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under the cotton program, is the subsidy we are paying to processors included in that amount, or not?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; but it is an indirect subsidy now. The subsidy under the new law is somewhat camouflaged. It is paid to the farmers but it really goes to the textile industry in the largest part. The reason for much of this total increase is in the figures which I have just read which are applicable to the cotton program.

In the wheat program, it went up to \$683 million compared with \$525 million for 1965.

In the conservation payment program it was almost identical, \$224 million for 1966, compared with \$215 million for 1965.

In the soil bank program—which is on the way out, as the distinguished Senator knows—it was \$135 million, compared with \$160 million for 1965.

In the sugar program it was \$61 million compared with \$64 million in 1965.

In the wool incentive program, it was \$34 million compared with \$18 million for 1965.

So the principal increases would appear to be the ones that I have mentioned for cotton and wool, plus, of course, the brand new program for the cropland adjustment program, which was \$44 million. There was no such program in 1965.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator read the figure for cotton payments?

Mr. HOLLAND. The cotton payments for 1966 were \$786 million, compared with \$70 million in 1965.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is the greatest increase.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is the largest amount. There are two other sizable increases, one being for the wool incentive program and the other of the new cropland adjustment program, which was \$44 million, and which was not in operation in 1965.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And the cotton program, according to the Senator from Florida, embraces money that goes not to the cotton farmer, but to the manufacturer of textile goods?

Mr. HOLLAND. It is largely an indirect subsidy to the textile manufacturers.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does the Senator have the figure of the reduction of money from Commodity Credit loans?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have that information at my office; I do not have it here. The items I have placed in the RECORD do not cover that item. The Commodity Credit situation is a troublesome one to the Senator from Florida, because whereas the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget have been working with me for the last 2 or 3 years, as the Senator knows, to restore the deficits in the Commodity Credit Corporation capital structure to bring about a

sound current condition, this year they have run back in the other direction and have put in by way of restoration less than half of the established deficit they had allowed for 1966, besides not going back to the deficit for 1961, which they had assured us they would restore.

I am sorry I do not have that figure. I will be glad to have the Senator from Georgia put it in the RECORD.

Mr. TALMADGE. I do not have the figures at hand. The able Senator from Florida serves as able chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. I think the committee will determine that there is less money going for loans for the Commodity Credit Corporation, and more money going directly to the farmers. The purpose is to try to divert cotton from going into storehouses and attempt to get the money to go to the cotton farmers.

Mr. HOLLAND. I realize that is the purpose of the legislation which was so ably handled by the Senator from Georgia. I am sorry I cannot supply the figures, but I am certain those figures will come out in detail when we have hearings on the agricultural appropriation bill. I shall be happy to have them supplied by the Senator from Georgia, or I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Senator. I am sure that, as has been his custom, the Senator will proceed very thoroughly into these matters, as he always has.

Mr. HOLLAND. The sole purpose of my putting these items in the RECORD at this time is that the official report of the Department of Agriculture shows the immense sums, not of loans, but of direct payments, made by the Department of Agriculture under legislation we passed here—and the Department is not responsible for that—in the last reporting year, 1966.

I think in these days when we are trying to learn where these funds are being spent, we need the reporting of such immense expenditures, funds which have been spent by all departments, whether it be the Department of Agriculture or other departments.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I certainly share the feeling of the Senator from Florida that the Congress of the United States should look into every expenditure of the Government, but I do not think we should select the farmers who earn the lowest income of any citizens to be the first victims of an economy wave.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida serves not only on the Agriculture Legislative Committee but also, as the Senator from Georgia has said, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. He shares sympathy with the agricultural producers expressed by the Senator from Georgia. At the same time he thinks this immense amount of over \$3 billion should be investigated carefully by the Senate and House committees, because the public will be looking at it as one place where there may be a possibility for economy.

JOHN CONNOR PROVIDED SOUND LEADERSHIP AS SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, John Connor's resignation as Secretary of Commerce represents a loss to President Johnson's administration and to the people of our Nation.

Secretary Connor has been one of the most dedicated and effective spokesmen American business has had in government in this century. He is a man of strong personal convictions and great vision. He brought to his post within the administration an extraordinary ability to communicate the views of his associates in business and industry. He has done a magnificent job of carrying to his own contacts in the business world the complexity of the challenges confronting both business and government.

Secretary Connor has worked closely with the Congress and its committees. And I know that the Members of this Chamber have found him among the most responsive and cooperative of witnesses, a man with the breadth of mind, the background, and the understanding to place the most complex issues in perspective.

As chairman of the Committee on Public Works it has been my privilege to work closely with Secretary Connor on such legislation as the Appalachian Regional Development Act, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and Federal aid highway legislation. The Secretary has been helpful in these matters and the committee and the Senate have profited from his counsel on this legislation and on many other occasions.

Thanks, in large part, to the ground-work done by the Department of Commerce under Secretary Connor's leadership, the 89th Congress was able to write into law a remarkably comprehensive and enlightened program to strengthen the private economy.

The broad range of this program includes the most extensive mutual cooperation between private business and Government in our history.

We are well acquainted with the balance-of-payments problems which have chronically plagued our economy for years. Today we stand a better chance of overcoming those deficits because Secretary Connor and President Johnson, working with other members of the administration, succeeded in driving home to business interests the absolute necessity for a workable voluntary program.

The improvements we have experienced through the voluntary program are encouraging. And we have every reason to feel encouraged by the steady increase in the value of exports, the sales of U.S. goods through exhibits and trade centers abroad and by the continued attraction of foreign visitors to our country this past 2 years.

In each of these successful efforts, Secretary Connor has performed a decisive role.

He has had the intelligence and determination to pursue the goals established for his Department by the Con-